

# Submittal Report

Financial Project:	444008-4-52-01	Submittal Type:	PLANS
Submittal Phase:	REVISED	Submittal Staff Type:	CONSULTANT
Received Date:	10/28/2022	Response Due Date:	1/27/2023
Grace Period:	0	District:	FIRST
Status:	CLOSED	Create Date:	10/28/2022
Create User Id:	RD158JJ	Last Update:	1/3/2023
		Last Update User Id:	RD158JJ

Description:

Phase IIR Plans Submittal

This email shall serve as a transmittal letter for a Submittal of Phase II Revised plans review. Please provide Phase II Revised comments for this project. Plans and supporting documents can be found in the ERC under the Documents tab or on the local server at the following location. This Phase IIR review is also a full review.

ERP: \dotsd1cadd\ERP\44400845201\Phase IIR

The following component set has been included in the Phase IIR submittal: Roadway Plans, Signing and Pavement Marking Plans, ITS Plans, Structures Plans, and Roadway Verified Utilities.

PSEE link: <https://fdotwp2.dot.state.fl.us/ProjectSuiteEnterpriseEdition/Pages/Project/Project.aspx?item=444008&itemSeg=4>

## Threads:

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Abra Horne	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Alfredo Rodriguez	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Amy Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Andra Diggs	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Benjamin Rodgers	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
BERENICE SUEIRO	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
41	COMMENT AGREED WITH			CULTURAL RESOURCES,ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
BERENICE SUEIRO	12/27/2022	1	

Phase IIR plans (dated October 2022) were compared to Phase II plans (dated July 2020). There have been no substantial changes to the scope of work. A cultural resource coordination letter was prepared for this project and sent to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on July 15, 2021, to document that the project will result in a finding of no adverse effect. The SHPO concurred with this finding on August 3, 2021. No further cultural resource coordination is necessary unless there are changes to the scope of work and/or right-of-way requirements.

Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

Thank you for your review.

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Bessie Reina	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Blake Stallworth	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Brent Setchell	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Casey Schley	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Catie Neal	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	5
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
25	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Catie Neal	12/22/2022	1	

This project will require an environmental certification from the Environmental Management Office (EMO). Please contact Kristin Caruso (kristin.caruso@dot.state.fl.us) in EMO to provide the Environmental Determination Worksheet (EDW) as soon as possible. On the EDW, please fill out the top portion and then responses to questions #1 through #6, and include a project location map. The EMO Dept. will fill-out remaining information. According to the current production schedule, this project is scheduled to go to Production on April 12, 2024. Environmental certifications are typically issued within 2 weeks prior to the R/W acquisition date (if applicable) and 2 weeks prior to the production date. Please advise EMO if the production schedule for this project changes. EMO will continue to review this project during subsequent phase reviews for environmental involvement.

Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
An Environmental Determination Worksheet (EDW) will be provided to the Environmental Management Office before the end of January 2023. The production date is not expected to change from April 12, 2024.			

Catie Neal	1/20/2023	1	
Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
26	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF., THREATENED/ENDANGERED SPECIES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Catie Neal	12/22/2022	1		
Section 7-1.4: Compliance with Federal Endangered Species Act and other Wildlife Regulations of the FDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction manual should be adhered to for wildlife involvement during construction. This section addresses what the contractor must do in the event of unanticipated interactions with protected species and the requirement to notify the FDOT a minimum of 30 days in advance of using an off-site area for ancillary construction needs (e.g. staging, borrow-pits).				
Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1		
Agreed-the contractor will be required to adhere to the FDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction manual, including complying with wildlife rules and regulations.				
Catie Neal	1/20/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
27	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.,WETLANDS
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Catie Neal	12/22/2022	1	
	It appears there are wetlands and surface waters within and/or adjacent to the project limits. Please show the limits of the wetlands and/or surface waters and label on the plans to determine the potential involvement with this resource. Contact the District Permits Coordinator by this ERC response due date to determine if permits and wetland mitigation are required.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	Surface waters and wetlands are present within the right of way. Improvements include milling and resurfacing the road, widening the inside shoulders, guardrail replacement, and repair of bridge expansion joints. New fiber optic cable will be installed in existing spare intelligent transportation system (ITS) conduits along the length of the project. These improvements will not impact jurisdictional wetlands or surface waters. Project activities that will impact surface waters involve wildlife crossing enhancements that are proposed at three locations known as Crossing A, Crossing B, and Crossing D. No wetland impacts will occur. Surface water delineations were conducted at these locations and are shown on the roadway plans and detailed in the drainage special details of the submitted plans.			
	The mainline roadway improvements have been determined to be exempt from permitting. A permit modification was submitted to SFWMD on December 9, 2022 for the widening of the inside shoulders. The SFWMD reviewers have indicated they have no comments and issuance of the modification is anticipated. On January 4, 2023, FDEP confirmed that the wildlife crossing enhancements are exempt from Section 404 permitting.			
	Catie Neal	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
28	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.,THREATENED/ENDANGERED SPECIES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Catie Neal	12/22/2022	1	
	The project is located within the Frequent Range of the Florida black bear range. Additionally, there are (19 nuisance reports and 12 roadkill reports of the Florida black bear) within 100 feet of the project limits. As a result, we recommend including the black bear Special Provision in the specifications package. Please coordinate with Kristin Caruso (kristin.caruso@dot.state.fl.us) in the Environmental Management Office for further information if needed.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	Agreed-the black bear Special Provision will be included in the specifications package.			
	Catie Neal	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
29	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OFF.,THREATENED/ENDANGERED SPECIES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Catie Neal	12/22/2022	1	
	The project is located within/adjacent to potential eastern indigo snake habitat. Please include the Special Provision for the species in the specifications package.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	Agreed-the eastern indigo snake Special Provision will be included in the specifications package.			
	Catie Neal	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Charles Manganaro	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	15

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
6	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	
	Sheet 4 – pay items shown for fence are shown as type A fence. The existing fence is a type B fence with Barbed wire.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/19/2023	1	

The fence pay items will be changed to Type B with barbed wire to match existing.

Charles Manganaro 1/24/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
7	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	
	Sheet 4 – add pay item 999-25 for Initial Contingency Amount and pay item 999-102			
	Ken Muzyk	1/19/2023	1	
	We will add pay item 999-25. Pay item 999-102 will be budgeted by the Project Manager and is not included in the contractor bid items.			
	Charles Manganaro	1/24/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
8	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	
	Sheet 6 – should pavement design for the median shoulder base widening be increased in thickness to account for the use of the shoulder for emergency evacuation?			
	Ken Muzyk	1/19/2023	1	
	Only the outside shoulder is used for emergency evacuation as the inside shoulders on the 48 bridges within the project limits are only 6' wide. If the inside bridge shoulders are widened in the future, the inside shoulder pavement structural number exceeds that required for 3% ESAL per the FPDM.			
	Charles Manganaro	1/24/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
9	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	
	General comment – has the designer taken any borings in area of proposed median shoulder widening to verify if A-8 material was placed in depth on previous project in areas outside the original 2:1 slope? This would result in subsoil excavation.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/19/2023	1	
	No geotechnical borings have been obtained for the proposed median shoulder widening since it is within the limits of the existing stabilized shoulder.			
	Charles Manganaro	1/24/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
10	COMMENT AGREED WITH			CONSTRUCTION
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	
	Sheet 8 – bridge information is indicating N/A for Begin Milling and Resurfacing although it indicates asphalt deck surface.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/19/2023	1	
	The begin/end stations for milling and resurfacing are only provided for the concrete bridges. The friction course is being replaced on the asphalt bridges so the milling/resurfacing does not stop.			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
11	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	
	Sheets 14 and 15 – note 2 – normal process for asphalt placement requires a structural course to be placed as a uniform layer. Overbuild layers do not add to structural number of the pavement value. Typical section sheets and details need to indicate the proposed structural course thickness same as shown on sheet 29.			

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1

The overbuild is in isolated areas and limited thicknesses. The contractor can either pave it separately or together with the structural course as allowed by the note. The overbuild was not included in the pavement design.

Charles Manganaro 1/26/2023 1

Please note it is not recommended to place overbuild with a structural layer. This will change the density requirement of the structural layer.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
12	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1		
General comment - Will there be a requirement to have an environmentalist on the project for the Contractor while working?				
Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1		
No, an environmentalist is not required on the project beyond what is normally done.				
Charles Manganaro	1/24/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
13	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1		
Sheet 59 – why are loops shown in the shoulders of the north and south bound roadways? Please clarify quantity for payment.				
Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1		
This is a Telemetered Traffic Monitoring Site (TTMS) monitored by Central Office. They require loops on the shoulders since the outside shoulders are used for evacuations.				
Charles Manganaro	1/26/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
14	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1		
Sheet 59 – plan is indicating conduit encasing sensor and loop leads to remain. Does this mean it is acceptable to splice in the pull boxes?				
Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1		
Yes, it is acceptable to splice the loop lead in cable within the pull box as shown.				
Charles Manganaro	1/26/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
15	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1		
Sheet 59 – plan is showing the existing pull box to remain along the southbound shoulder. The proposed grades will change based on median widening. Plan should show a new pull box.				
Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1		
We will provide a new pull box due to the grade change.				
Charles Manganaro	1/26/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
16	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1		

Sheet 70 - Plan indicates the proposed fence gates should not have more than 4 inches from the bottom of the gate to the ground. Should the fence gate have a sliding plate installed that would go down to the ground to eliminate smaller animals from going beneath the fence and onto the roadway. The plate can be raised up and locked up by wing nuts.

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1

We recommend keeping the gate design with the maximum 4-inch gap as currently shown in the plans. The wildlife fencing is intended to deter animals from entering the roadway, and in this corridor the fence and gates were designed to deter large mammals such as the black bear, white-tailed deer and the endangered Florida panther. The gate design with the 4-inch gap has been accepted by the wildlife agencies and Department environmental reviewers for adjacent segments of I-75 to meet the requirements for the target species in the corridor.

Charles Manganaro 1/26/2023 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
17	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	

Sheets 107 and 142 – plan is showing a 1:2 slope to be constructed behind the guardrail. Why not show a 1:6 slope to avoid maintenance concerns?

Ken Muzyk 1/20/2023 1

We can flatten the side slope behind the median guardrail to 1:3 or 1:4 if that resolves the maintenance concern.

Charles Manganaro 1/26/2023 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
18	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	

Sheet 147 - the plan should designate a "Speed and Law Enforcement Officer" since this case is not covered by specification 102-7 while an officer is used during daytime.

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1

Speed and Law Enforcement Officer (pay item #999-102-1) will be included for the project by the FDOT PM. Per BOE, there will be no reference made to these services in the plans.

Charles Manganaro 1/26/2023 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
19	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	

General comment – plan should address the mixture (50 %-50%) of soil and recycle asphalt for unpaved shoulder blended to stabilize the proposed shoulder area. Designer may want to discuss with Maintenance Office for how they perform their maintenance work on existing shoulders.

Ken Muzyk 1/20/2023 1

I'm not sure that I understand the comment. The median paved shoulder is being widened from 4' to 10' leaving only 2' of stabilized shoulder compared to the current 4'. It seems that the widening would eliminate or minimize the current maintenance work?

Charles Manganaro 1/26/2023 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
20	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			CONSTRUCTION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Charles Manganaro	12/21/2022	1	

Sheets SQ-2 and SQ-3 – quantity shown for relocation of temporary barrier can not be shown more than what was furnish and installed. Is the intent to only work one location at a time? Make sure barrier wall is shown in locations where wildlife crossings are being constructed to protect the area needed for the staging of equipment and material for the proposed work.

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1

The temporary barrier wall relocation quantity is greater than the F&I length because the segments of barrier wall will be relocated multiple times for different sections of guardrail replacements. The currently under construction resurfacing project to the east (444008-2) has experienced traffic delays at times due to the length of lane closures. To minimize delays, each segment will be replaced separately to reduce the lane closure length.

For the wildlife crossings, the TTCP includes note #3 under the General Construction Notes (sheet 146) to off-load materials utilizing a lane closure. There are gaps in the existing guardrail for the contractor to access each wildlife crossing location. And each location has available space to stage materials behind the existing guardrail. We do not anticipate adding temporary barrier wall for staging material.

Charles Manganaro 1/26/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Chelsea Scheid	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
----------------	----------	------------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Chris Coughlin	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	11
----------------	---------------	------------	--------	----

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
30	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 11 / Typical Section Details (2)	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
Southbound Standard Resurfacing Detail (Straight): Double asterisks (\*\*) are depicted with the proposed 0.02 cross slopes. Please clarify what the asterisks are intended to represent.

Ken Muzyk 1/24/2023 1  
We will add the match existing cross slope note for the triple asterisk notation.

Chris Coughlin 1/25/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
31	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 13 / Typical Section Details (4)	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
Detail is titled 'Constant Depth Milling Detail'. Asterisk (\*) indicates the milling depth varies at point A. On other constant depth mill details, different depths are not defined at the crown & edges of pavement. Please review.

Ken Muzyk 1/24/2023 1  
We will change the title of the milling detail from "constant" to "variable" depth.

Chris Coughlin 1/25/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
32	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 27 / Typical Section Details (18)	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
'Match Existing' is called for approaching some bridges, while others call for 0.02 proposed cross slopes. Please elaborate on design approach to the scenarios. When 0.02 is proposed, are the approach slabs & bridges graded at 0.02?

Ken Muzyk 1/24/2023 1  
The approach slabs and bridge cross slopes are not provided and expected to transition from the cross slope correction cross slopes to match existing. The few locations that indicate "match existing" rather than 0.02 are isolated locations where cross slope correction is not feasible and happen to coincidentally be on that particular bridge approach.

Chris Coughlin 1/25/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
33	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 28 / Typical Section Details (18)	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	12/22/2022	1	

a) Typical Section (2) identifies a proposed 3/4" mill for the asphalt bridge decks. Is this intended to also apply to approach slabs? Please review & clarify.

b) Note 2: Note indicates the contractor is to reduce milling depth on approach slabs if the existing pavement thickness is less than the prescribed milling depth. Is a 3/4" mill proposed? Are there concerns that scabbing may occur on the approach slabs, or concrete decks, if the existing asphalt depth slightly exceeds the proposed mill depth?

Ken Muzyk	1/24/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

a) The 3/4" only applies to the bridge deck. Note 2 on the same sheet clarifies the milling depth on the approach slabs. The quantities for the milling/resurfacing change at the begin/end bridge.

b) No, we are not expecting that. 3/4" is only proposed on the bridge. The -2- project contains the same detail and the outside lane on all bridges have been milled/resurfaced and have had no issues that we are aware of and no questions from the CEI about it.

Chris Coughlin	1/25/2023	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
34	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 30 / Typical Section Details (20)	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	12/22/2022	1	

Median Crossover Pavement - Section B-B: Median Crossover Plan depicts a side drain along the section line. Consider depicting. Also, consider defining proposed Limits of Construction on detail.

Ken Muzyk	1/24/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

We will label the limits of construction to both sides of Section B-B.

Chris Coughlin	1/25/2023	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
35	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 46 / General Notes	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	12/22/2022	1	

Note 3: Effective for the July 2022 Standard Specifications, Special Events will no longer be listed on the General Notes sheet. Instead, they'll be listed in Special Provision SP0080604. Please review.

Ken Muzyk	1/24/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

General note no. 3 will be removed. Since there are no special events, the Special Provision will be omitted.

Chris Coughlin	1/25/2023	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
36	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 58 / Roadway Plan (12)	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Chris Coughlin	12/22/2022	1	

Inside shoulder widening appears to taper approaching the NB terminal near Sta. 885+40, LT. Typical Section & details only indicate typical 6' widening/construction. Please clarify proposed minimum.

Ken Muzyk	1/24/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

We will change the proposed shoulder to be 6' wide and eliminate the taper.

Chris Coughlin	1/25/2023	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed



No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
37	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 145 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
Typical Section Details (19) indicate there are ramps at Everglades Blvd. Consider providing an Advanced Warning Sign diagram for the ramps.

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1  
An Advanced Warning Sign diagram will be provided for the ramps at Everglades Blvd.

Chris Coughlin 1/26/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
38	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. 148 / Temporary Traffic Control Plan	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
How is construction of the shoulder widening & guardrail construction to be phased? Will the shoulder widening be performed first, & then overbuild on top of? If so, will the newly constructed structural course on the shoulders need to be re-addressed?

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1  
Resurfacing/overbuild detail #2 and #3 are the only details that require overbuild on the inside shoulder. Out of these areas, there are 4 within sections that guardrail is to be replaced. The final overbuild structural course within these 4 sections will be completed during the median guardrail replacement. The construction phasing includes the following:

First, the inside travel lane will be milled and resurfaced (see notes #2 & 3 of the Construction Phasing Notes). Second, the inside shoulder widening in the areas (beyond the guardrail replacement sections) will be completed (see note #4). Third, the inside shoulder widening, and guardrail will be constructed (see note #6). This step includes shifting traffic, placing the barrier wall, removing the existing guardrail, inside shoulder widening and shoulder overbuild, then installing new guardrail.

Chris Coughlin 1/31/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
39	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Sheet No. SQ-3 / Summary of Quantities	ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
Construction Notes in Temporary Traffic Control Plan do not specify construction phases, & all specific work that is to be accomplished in each phase. Consider indicating in notes, providing guidance on what is to be accomplished in Phase IV.

Ken Muzyk 1/26/2023 1  
The phasing notes will be updated to include Phase titles for each phase.

Chris Coughlin 1/26/2023 1  
Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
40	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ROADWAY

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

Chris Coughlin 12/22/2022 1  
Attached is the marked-up plan set for your reference.

Please feel free to contact me if you want to discuss any of the comments.  
Chris Coughlin, P.E.  
Florida Department of Transportation D1  
Chris.Coughlin@dot.state.fl.us  
(Cell) 813-447-9207

Ken Muzyk 1/24/2023 1  
Thank you for your review Chris.

Chris Coughlin

1/25/2023

1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Chris Schultz	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
CHRISTINE ARNOLD	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Forestt	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
1	COMMENT AGREED WITH		Contamination Memorandum	CONTAMINATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Christopher Forestt	11/17/2022	1	

THIS COMMENT DOES NOT REQUIRE A RESPONSE FROM THE DESIGN TEAM, OTHER THAN ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

As in the attached Contamination Memorandum, there are no anticipated contamination-related or hazardous materials-related impacts to construction on this segment of the project.

The Contamination Assessment & Remediation (CAR) Contractor's testing (see attached report) found no hazardous materials on the bridge components that will be subject to construction.

Although a Contamination Note was requested in a memorandum for the related "-1" project, that note is not applicable to this "-4" segment because the contaminated site causing the need for that note is outside of these "-4" Project Limits. The EMO requested the Design Team retain the NPDES Contamination Note the appropriate segment ("-3") after review of that Project's/Segment's Phase-IV Plan Set in ERC.

Thank you.

Ken Muzyk

1/19/2023

1

Thank you for your review.

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Christopher Mollitor	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Clifton Johnson	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Darryl Richard	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
David Ayers	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	INACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Deborah Barnhill	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Desiree Davis	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
58	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		UTV-1	UTILITIES

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Desiree Davis	12/28/2022	1	

The FPID number used in notes 3,4, and 5 does not match the plan set.

Ken Muzyk

1/20/2023

1

We will revise the FPID numbers used in notes 3,4, and 5 to -4-.

Desiree Davis

1/20/2023

1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Donald Cashdollar	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Earl Taylor	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
44	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ACCESS MANAGEMENT
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Earl Taylor	12/27/2022	1		
	Is the variable depth structural course due to the milling within these areas? The elevation of the top of the paving will not change, Just the depth?			
Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1		
	The milling and corresponding resurfacing thicknesses vary based on the existing cross slope. In locations that have flatter cross slopes, the milling depths were increased to achieve an average and trend of 2.25" depth. The surface elevation does change due to the cross slope correction.			
Earl Taylor	1/20/2023	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Edward Stevens	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Elias Bowne	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Elizabeth Sofsky	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ellie Wilson	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Garfield Howell	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
21	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			SIGNING AND MARKING
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Garfield Howell	12/21/2022	1		
	S-6, S-14, S-17, S-19, S-21 Please consider adding wrong way arrow countermeasures for both direction of travel at each median opening per Roadway Bulletin 21-07.			
Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1		
	RDB 21-07 was issued specifically for Arterials and Collectors. The Limited Access section of the FDM does not specify the requirement for wrong way arrows.			
Garfield Howell	1/30/2023	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Gary Kaser	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Gena Batman	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
2	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			ESTIMATES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Gena Batman	11/30/2022	1		Phase 52 Construction Cost is \$31,160,318.25 PDC based on Trns*Port quantities. See attached file.
Ken Muzyk	12/6/2022	1		Thank you Gena.
Gena Batman	12/7/2022	1		Response Accepted & Comment Closed
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Gregory Bowne	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Harley Davidson	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
James Beverly	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jason Mobsby	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeff Kipfinger	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey James	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jeffrey M Jones	IN-HOUSE PROJECT MANAGER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
John Kubicki	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Jonathon Bennett	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
JOSEPH WAS	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Karina Della Sera	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Katharine Causey	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Kayla Sapp	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Keith Robbins	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ken Muzyk	CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER	1/27/2023	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments

Kenneth Collier	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
-----------------	----------	------------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

KENNETH YINGER	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	2
----------------	----------	------------	--------	---

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
42	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

KENNETH YINGER	12/27/2022	1	
----------------	------------	---	--

The Drainage Special Details (2) for Crossing A shows a proposed wildlife timber canal bridge at STA 299+77, RT. in the plan view of this detail, but Section B-B STA 299+70.000 RT. calls out a proposed wildlife concrete pile canal bridge. Please review.

Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

On Section B-B the label will be revised to correctly describe the "Prop. Wildlife Timber Canal Bridge".

KENNETH YINGER	2/12/2023	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
43	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans	DRAINAGE

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
------------	------------	---------	--------------

KENNETH YINGER	12/27/2022	1	
----------------	------------	---	--

The SWPPP (1), I. (11) (A) mentions that runoff from the existing roadway is typically conveyed in a curb and gutter system and collected in closed flume inlets. However, that does not appear to be the case for this project. Please ensure that the SWPPP is written specifically for this project.

Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

Per the direction of the 2023 FDM and coordination with District Drainage, the SWPPP sheet will be removed from the plans. The SWPPP narrative will not be updated.

KENNETH YINGER	2/12/2023	1	
----------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Kim Strickland	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
----------------	---------------	------------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Kisan Patel	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
-------------	---------------	------------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Kristin Caruso	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
----------------	---------------	------------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Kyle Purvis	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
-------------	---------------	------------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

LAUREN PETERS	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
---------------	---------------	------------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Lawrence Zagardo	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
------------------	---------------	------------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

LEANNA SCHAILL	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	INACTIVE	0*
----------------	---------------	------------	----------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Mark Roberts	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
--------------	---------------	------------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Marlena Gore	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
--------------	----------	------------	--------	---

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Marlene Hebert	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
----------------	---------------	------------	--------	----

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
------	------------	----------	--------	----------

Marshall Douberley	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Martin Smith	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Matthew A. Miller	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
MATTHEW LITTERAL	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Melissa Slater	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Michael Grant	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Michael Little	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Michael Rima	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Nathan Poole	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	3

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
22	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		General	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Nathan Poole	12/21/2022	1	

Please confirm if conflicts between the new guardrail (or other project improvements) and the existing ITS infrastructure are anticipated.

Ken Muzyk	1/24/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

Conflicts are not anticipated between the new guardrail (or other project improvements) and the existing ITS infrastructure.

Nathan Poole	2/14/2023	1	
--------------	-----------	---	--

Thank you.

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
23	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		IT-5	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Nathan Poole	12/21/2022	1	

For General Note 2, please update the contact information to Belinda Thomas (Belinda.Thomas@dot.state.fl.us and 863-519-2726)

Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

The contact information will be updated as requested.

Nathan Poole	2/14/2023	1	
--------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
24	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		IT-5	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Nathan Poole	12/21/2022	1	

Please confirm if the 633-3-15 pay item note is necessary. It appears this pay item is not being used.

Ken Muzyk	1/26/2023	1	
-----------	-----------	---	--

The pay item note will be removed once confirmed we do not need the pay item.

Nathan Poole	2/14/2023	1	
--------------	-----------	---	--

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nicole Monies	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1
No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
4	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Nicole Monies	12/13/2022	1		
	Permit applications were submitted on 12/7/2022.			
Ken Muzyk	12/13/2022	1		
	Comment Agreed & Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Nikki Gilmer	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
OTIS DUKES	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Patrick Bateman	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Paul Simmons	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Phillip Chapman	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
3	COMMENT AGREED WITH			ROADWAY
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Phillip Chapman	12/7/2022	1		
	12/7/22 - A No Rail Involved cert was issued under 444008-1 on 7/29/2020 and is applicable to this segment of the project. The No Rail can be located under the -1 in PSEE as well. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.			
Ken Muzyk	12/13/2022	1		
	Comment Agreed & Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ramasamy Venkatesan	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	1

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
5	RESPONSE ACCEPTED			GEOTECH/MATERIALS
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Ramasamy Venkatesan	12/13/2022	1		
	Suggest any soil borings done for this project and falls within this project limits be shown in the appropriate cross sections/locations. Any geotech report generated for this project be included as part of the submittal			
Ken Muzyk	12/13/2022	1		
	There were no soil borings performed or geotech reports prepared for this project.			
Ramasamy Venkatesan	12/15/2022	1		
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Renjan Joseph	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Ricardo Policicchio	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Scott Ellis	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Scott Presson	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Sergio Figueroa	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Shiva Moonian	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Soheila Sadough	REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	13

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
45	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		General	STRUCTURES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1		
There are various format type comments. See attached markup of documents.				
Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1		
So noted. Revisions will be made where needed. Note that some of these format comments were not considered relevant or necessary and were therefore not implemented.				
Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
46	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Structures Plans General	STRUCTURES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1		
Verify if any bridge repairs are being done to Bridges 030224 & 030225 over West Hinton. These bridges are within project limits, but no bridge repairs are shown in structures plans.				
Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1		
An inspection of all the bridges along Alligator Alley was performed early in the project to identify those bridges where the asphalt overlay/expansion joints were failing. 030224 & 030225 did not exhibit any issues and were therefore not included in the list of bridges that required repairs.				
Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
47	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Structures Plans Sheet B-8	STRUCTURES
Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For	
Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1		
Bridge 030001 is 10 feet shorter than the adjacent bridge, so the Elevation View is not applicable for both bridges. However, only Bridge 030214 has joint repairs. Therefore, either place a note that the Elevation is applicable only to bridge 030214 or double dimension the elevation view to reflect the difference in span length.				
Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1		
The elevation view is currently showing only the relevant span lengths for the bridge where the repair work is required; however, double dimensions will be added to clarify.				
Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1		
Response Accepted & Comment Closed				



No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
48	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Structures Plans Sheet B-9	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	Bridge 030002 is 10 feet shorter than the adjacent bridge, so the Elevation View is not applicable for both bridges. However, only Bridge 030217 has joint repairs. Therefore, either place a note that the Elevation is applicable only to bridge 030217 or double dimension the elevation view to reflect the difference in span length.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	The elevation view is currently showing only the relevant span lengths for the bridge where the repair work is required; however, double dimensions will be added to clarify.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
49	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans General	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	Seems there should be some General Notes at least with governing specs and assumed loadings that the wildlife bridges will carry, along with any specific instructions regarding wildlife during construction.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	These miscellaneous structures are not intended for public vehicular or pedestrian use and as such, it was decided to not treat them like typical bridges but more like drainage boxes or gravity walls that do not include this type of information in their drawings or standard. This approach was discussed early on with and agreed to by FDOT Structures in order to minimize design costs.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
50	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans Sheet B-3	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	a. In addition to rubber, is a Type D Silicone Sealant allowed per standard index 458-110 (1 of 2) Note 1? b. Confirm if the Pay Item 458-1-21 is applicable if rubber is the intended joint material. The pay item description says it is for Type D silicone sealant.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	The intent is to use Type D silicone sealant material as specified in Section 932. As such, the label for the joint will be revised to "poured joint" to more closely match the Standards and Specifications.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
51	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans Sheet B-5	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	a. Contractor to submit a dewatering plan for approval. Instruct Contractor how dewatering is to be paid for (separate pay item or incidental to another pay item). b. Show Water Elevation. Contractor needs something to go on to bid on dewatering.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	a. The end blocks are located at or near the top of the berms of these ponds so dewatering is not expected to be needed. In any case, the Specifications include dewatering in the cost the concrete/excavation work associated with these structures. b. Determining water elevations was not included in the scope of this contract and therefore these elevations are not available and cannot be shown on the plan sheets. As mentioned above, the end blocks are located above the water elevation so dewatering is not expected to be needed.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
52	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans Sheet B-5	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	The lap splice for WWF should be 1 ft or minimum recommended by WWF manufacturer whichever is larger.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	Similar to rebar, the manufacturer of the WWF should be irrelevant in the determination of the lap splice length since it is covered by Section 5.10.8.5 of the AASHTO LRFD Specs. The 1' length specified is more than adequate for this temperature and shrinkage steel.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
53	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans Sheet B-6	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	Label Crossings to Match Roadway Plans Designation A,B, & D. Typical comment.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	Although the stationing is more than adequate to identify the location of crossing, the Roadway Letter Designation will be added adjacent to the stationing.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
54	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans Sheet BQ-1	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	Pay item 470-1 is more appropriate for sawn lumber, but there does not seem to be another pay item for timber. Should the Contractor provide the poles on a lump sum for each pole under a custom pay item, instead of showing the MB? Confirm with the FDOT structures PM the best way for the Contractor to bid the timber. Does the Department own some of the poles already that could be used here? If so, state in a note so the Contractor may bid appropriately.			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	The use of this pay item was discussed with FDOT staff early in the project and it has been used to pay for posts/piles on boardwalks previously. As your comment states, FDOT does not have a "better" pay item to use so it was decided to use 470-1. Note that the County does have some old poles available that could be used, but it was decided to not include a note dictating their use since it would be impossible to ensure that these poles would be available at the time of construction nor that the poles would be in suitable condition which would open FDOT up to a claim.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
55	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Plans General	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	Should the timber poles be treated with anything to mitigate wood bearing insects?			
	Ken Muzyk	1/20/2023	1	
	The pay item 470-1 is for TREATED Structural Timber with the required treatment covered by the 955 specification.			
	Soheila Sadough	1/20/2023	1	
	Response Accepted & Comment Closed			

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
56	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Bridge Calcs page 135	STRUCTURES
	<b>Created By</b>	<b>Created On</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Delegate For</b>
	Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	
	For the 4 span unit, 2 spans contribute to each end bent. 1.5 spans is shown.			

Ken Muzyk 1/20/2023 1

Agree, but note that the variable (Ns\_EJ) in question is not used anywhere in the calculations since the Total Thermal Movement Length (LTU\_EJ) is defined as  $2 * 40' = 80'$  just to the left which is correct and it is this value that is used to evaluate the expansion joint's ability to handle the thermal movements of these bridges. The number of spans variable will be removed to eliminate confusion.

Soheila Sadough 1/20/2023 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

No	Status	Current Holder	Reference	Categories
57	RESPONSE ACCEPTED		Bridge Calcs page 3 and page 22	STRUCTURES

Created By	Created On	Version	Delegate For
Soheila Sadough	12/27/2022	1	

Since no calcs were submitted for the segment 4 timber bridge, the segment 2 calcs submitted were marked up with the span lengths of segment 4. Revise calcs See markup.

Ken Muzyk 1/20/2023 1

Note that those Segment 2 calculations that you pulled from the earlier project were not up to date for Segment 4. In the future, please feel free to call or email if you are missing documents needed to complete your review. Please find the correct calculations for this segment 4 submittal attached to this comment response.

Soheila Sadough 1/20/2023 1

Response Accepted & Comment Closed

Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Stu Myers	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Suraj Pamulapati	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Tara Rodrigues	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Todd Boehmer	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
TRINITY SCOTT	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wayne Shelton	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0*
Name	Assignment	Due Date	Status	Comments
Wendy Sands	LEAD REVIEWER	12/28/2022	ACTIVE	0